



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*MN*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/620,988   | 07/16/2003  | Ron Everett          | 030353              | 8827             |
| 67524  | 7590        | 05/15/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| FOX ROTHSCHILD, LLP<br>625 LIBERTY AVENUE<br>PITTSBURGH, PA 15222-3155 |             |                      |                     | MYINT, DENNIS Y  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2162   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 05/15/2007   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                          |                  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.          | Applicant(s)     |
|                          | 10/620,988               | EVERETT, RON     |
|                          | Examiner<br>Dennis Myint | Art Unit<br>2162 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dennis Myint. (3) Dennis M. Carleton (Applicant's Representative).  
 (2) Cam Y. Truong (Primary Examiner). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

On May 9, 2007, Dennis M. Carleton, Applicant's Representative, initiated an interview. Citing the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 101, Applicant's Representative presented that data structure of claim 1 is functional because it is stored on a computer-readable medium in light of MPEP § 2106.1. Examiner replied that said data structure is data structure per se. and lacks any functional step(s) which manipulates said data structure and, as such, said data structure is non-functional descriptive material per se. Applicant's Representative strongly disagrees on this point. Applicant's Representative said the inventor will be consulted how to proceed with the application.

Dennis Maynt  
✓ 08/10/00?

John E. Breene

JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



**Fox Rothschild LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

625 Liberty Avenue, 29th Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3115  
Tel 412.391.1334 Fax 412.391.6984  
www.foxrothschild.com

**DATE: APRIL 23, 2007**

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

|                                    |                               |  |                        |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| <b>TO:</b><br>Dennis Myint         | <b>COMPANY:</b><br>U.S.P.T.O. | <b>PAX NUMBER:</b><br>571 273 5629                                       | <b>PHONE NUMBER:</b>   |
| <b>FROM:</b><br>Dennis M. Carleton | <b>PHONE NUMBER:</b> (412)    | <b>EMAIL:</b> <a href="mailto:@foxrothschild.com">@foxrothschild.com</a> | <b>BILLING NUMBER:</b> |
| <b>NUMBER OF PAGES:</b>            | <b>CHARGE FILE #:</b>         | <b>PRIORITY:</b><br>REGULAR  | <b>LOG NUMBER:</b>     |

**IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES,  
PLEASE CALL (412) 394-5568 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.  
ORIGINAL DOCUMENT WILL FOLLOW BY MAIL**

URGENT  FOR REVIEW  PLEASE COMMENT  PLEASE REPLY  FOR YOUR INFORMATION

**NOTES/COMMENTS:**

**IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE:**

PURSUANT TO TREASURY REGULATIONS, ANY TAX ADVICE CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION (INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED OR RELIED UPON BY YOU OR ANY OTHER PERSON, FOR THE PURPOSE OF (I) AVOIDING PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, OR (II) PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING TO ANOTHER PARTY ANY TAX ADVICE ADDRESSED HEREIN.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.



Fox Rothschild LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

625 Liberty Avenue, 29th Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3115  
Tel 412.391.1334 Fax 412.391.6984  
[www.foxrothschild.com](http://www.foxrothschild.com)

Dennis M. Carleton  
Direct Dial: (412) 394-5568  
Email Address: [dcarleton@foxrothschild.com](mailto:dcarleton@foxrothschild.com)

April 23, 2007

VIA Facsimile (571) 273-5629

Dennis Myint  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

**Re: Phone conference regarding U.S. Application No. 10/620,988 (Everett) - § 101 Rejection**

Dear Mr. Myint:

In response to your Office Action dated 04/06/07 in the above-referenced application, I wish to discuss your response to our previous arguments and your claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In your rejection on page 4, paragraph 5, of the Office Action you state that the data structures are per say non-functional descriptive materials. This is counter to Office Policy as set forth in MPEP§ 2106.01. You have classified the claimed invention as "a data structure", which is defined in 2106.01 as "a physical or logical relationship among data elements designed to support specific data manipulation functions." It also clearly states that data structures are to be considered functional descriptive material as opposed to non-functional descriptive material. Note that non-functional descriptive material includes music, literary works and data compilations. The data structures of the present invention clearly does not fall into one of these classes. 2106.01 further states that when functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory. I believe your categorization of data structures as non-functional descriptive material is in error and find no support for your statement that data structures are per say non-functional descriptive material.

Please call to discuss. Thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

Dennis M. Carleton